

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

**JAMES MARIO PRIDGEN,
Petitioner,**

CIVIL ACTION

v.

**SHANNON,
THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY OF THE
COUNTY OF LANCASTER, and
THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE
STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA,
Respondents.**

NO. 00-4561

ORDER

AND NOW, this 2nd day of April, 2015, upon consideration of pro se petitioner's Motion 60(b) Regarding the Filing, and Circumstances Surrounding the Disposition (Document No. 94, filed December 29, 2014); pro se petitioner's Motion the Term [sic] Contained in Brief for 60(b) and Equitable Tolling (Document No. 95, filed February 4, 2015); and pro se petitioner's Motion to Define the Term Contained in Brief for 60(b) and Equitable Tolling (Document No. 96, filed February 12, 2015);¹ for the reasons stated in the accompanying Memorandum dated April 2, 2015, **IT IS ORDERED** that pro se petitioner's Motion 60(b) Regarding the Filing, and Circumstances Surrounding the Disposition is **DISMISSED**.

¹ Although styled as motions, pro se petitioner's Motion the Term [sic] Contained in Brief for 60(b) and Equitable Tolling (Document No. 95, filed February 4, 2015), and pro se petitioner's Motion to Define the Term Contained in Brief for 60(b) and Equitable Tolling (Document No. 96, filed February 12, 2015), which are nearly identical in substance, are actually explanatory submissions in further support of pro se petitioner's Motion 60(b) Regarding the Filing, and Circumstances Surrounding the Disposition. Nevertheless, to clear the docket, the Court **DENIES** the two documents styled by pro se petitioner as motions, Document No. 95 and Document No. 96.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that a certificate of appealability **WILL NOT ISSUE** because reasonable jurists would not debate whether the motion states a valid claim of the denial of constitutional rights or this Court's procedural rulings with respect to petitioner's claims. See 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2).

BY THE COURT:

/s/ Jan E. DuBois

DuBOIS, JAN E., J.